

United States District Court

For the Northern District of California

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

On August 3, 2011, Defendants filed a motion for leave to file their Amended Answer and Counterclaims to add counterclaims of breach of fiduciary duty and unjust enrichment. The motion is styled as an administrative motion and was not noticed for a hearing. On August 17, 2011, Plaintiff filed his opposition to the motion. Plaintiff argues that Defendants' motion is not a request for administrative relief that can be brought pursuant to Civil L.R. 7-11 and must comply with Civil L.R. 7-2.

Civil L.R. 7-11 states that “[t]he Court recognizes that during the course of case proceedings a party may require a Court order with respect to miscellaneous administrative matters, not otherwise governed by a federal statute, Federal or local rule or standing order of the assigned judge.” An administrative motion brought under Civil L.R. 7-11, compared to a motion

1 that complies with Civil L.R. 7-2, allows the non-moving party a shorter time-period and fewer
2 pages in which to oppose the motion and provides for no reply or oral argument.

3 A motion for leave to amend pleadings cannot be styled as an administrative motion under
4 Civil L.R. 7-11 because this matter is governed by Fed. R. Civ. P. 15. In this instance, Fed. R. Civ.
5 P. 15(a)(2) requires Defendants to seek leave of court because more than twenty-one days have
6 passed since Defendants served their Answer and Defendants do not have Plaintiff's written
7 consent to amend. Defendants are aware of this requirement and of the governing federal rule, and
8 they cite Rule 15(a) in their motion. Thus, this motion must comply with Civil L.R. 7-2¹ and is
9 procedurally defective in its current form. Accordingly,

10 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendants' motion is DENIED without prejudice to their
11 bringing a motion that complies with the requirements of Civil L.R. 7-2.

12 Dated: Cwi wrv52."4233



13 EDWARD J. DAVILA
14 United States District Judge

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 ¹ A review of other motions for leave to amend answers to add counter-claims filed in this district
25 confirms that such motions typically comply with the requirements of Civil L.R. 7-2 and are not
26 styled as administrative motions under Civil L.R. 7-11. See, e.g., Counter Motion for Leave to File
27 Counter Claim, Green Valley Corp. v. Caldo Oil Co., 09-CV-04028-LHK (N.D. Cal. Mar. 14,
2011), ECF No. 74; Motion for Leave to File Counterclaim, Juarez v. Jani-King of California, Inc.,
CIV. 09-3495 SC, (N.D. Cal. July 8, 2010), ECF No. 47; Motion for Leave To Amend Answer,
Phoenix Solutions, Inc. v. Sony Electronics, Inc., No. C 07-02112 MHP, (N.D. Cal. Apr. 18, 2008),
ECF No. 121.